

REMARKS

In the Office action of August 29, 2003, the Examiner indicated that claims 4-6 and 9-15 contained allowable subject matter, but objected to these claims as being dependent on a rejected claim. Claims 1-3, 7 and 8 stand rejected as being anticipated or obvious in view of the Wilson Patent.

In response to the office action Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify that the digital data signals sent by the mobile unit represent second voice commands. Allowable claim 4 is presented in independent form as new claim 16. Allowable claim 5 is canceled and presented in independent form as new claim 17. Allowable claim 9 is canceled and presented in independent form as new claim 18. Claims 16, 17 and 18 have the same scope as the claims they replace and are therefore in condition for allowance. Claims 6 and 10 to 15 depend directly or indirectly on allowable claims 17 and 18 and are therefore allowable. New claims 19 and 20 are presented for examination.

Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10 to 20 are pending of which claims 6 and 10 to 18 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 (as amended), claims 7 and 8 (as originally presented), and new claims 19 and 20.

As set forth in claims 1-3 Applicant's invention is a method for operating a system by voice command. In particular the invention set forth in claim 1 specifies a method wherein a mobile unit is in radio communication with a computer. The mobile unit recognizes a limited number of voice commands which are used to operate the mobile unit, for example to establish radio communications with the computer. Further second voice commands are communicated to the computer for recognition using a large vocabulary voice recognition program.

The reference applied by the Examiner entirely fails to disclose or suggest this dual voice recognition method, wherein simple commands sufficient to operate the functions of the mobile unit are recognized in the mobile unit, using a simple small vocabulary program, and more complex voice commands, such as requesting a connection to a particular person or telephone extension, or requesting data from the computer, are recognized by the computer using a large vocabulary voice recognition program.

The Wilson patent discloses a mobile unit for operating a television tuner, or a computing device. All voice recognition is done in the mobile unit. The Mobile unit receives from the application software running on the computer a vocabulary set that corresponds to the prompts being displayed to the user. Accordingly, while the mobile unit of Wilson in fact does voice recognition using a limited vocabulary program, there is no suggestion to provide a further large vocabulary recognition program in the computer with which the mobile unit communicates and to send voice commands as digital signals representing sounds to the computer for recognition using a large vocabulary voice recognition program. It is recognized that the application of the Wilson patent does store a large vocabulary, however, that vocabulary is only used to select words to send to the mobile unit to be included in the limited vocabulary voice recognition according to the prompts displayed.

Claims 1-3 and 19 are accordingly distinguished over the Wilson reference because the claims clearly specify a two stage voice recognition process, wherein a limited vocabulary, sufficient to operate the mobile unit is recognized in the mobile unit and further voice instructions are recognized in the computer.

Claims 7, 8 and 20 specify a mobile unit which includes a processor for recognizing a limited number of voice commands to control the radio of the mobile unit and a program for

PATENT

providing digital data signals corresponding to sounds as data packets to the radio module for transmission. The mobile unit of Wilson provides the limited voice recognition, but does not digitize voice signals for transmission to a computer. In fact, the signals sent by the mobile unit of Wilson to the computer are command signals that result from recognition of the voice commands in the mobile unit.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Maier
PTO Reg. No. 54,291
(212) 408-2538

Attorney for Applicant

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112